arXiv:hep-ph/0205243v3 25 Jul 2002

IFT-02/16

Option of light righthanded neutrinos avoiding oscillations[*]

Wojciech Królikowski

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Warsaw University
Hoża 69, PL–00–681 Warszawa, Poland

Abstract

A new explicit model of neutrino texture is presented, where in the overall 6×6 mass matrix the lefthanded and righthanded Majorana 3×3 components are diagonal with equal entries of opposite sign, while the Dirac 3×3 component is given as a diagonal hierarchical structure (possibly similar to the charged lepton and quark 3×3 mass matrices) deformed by the popular nearly bimaximal 3×3 mixing matrix. Then, all neutrino masses are light and $m_1 = -m_4$, $m_2 = -m_5$, $m_3 = -m_6$. The resulting neutrino oscillation formulae are *identical* with those working in the effective texture of three active neutrinos, based on this nearly bimaximal mixing matrix. Three (conventional) sterile neutrinos *do not oscillate* and so, are strictly *decoupled*. The suggested LSND effect *vanishes*. The not observed Chooz oscillation effect is consistently negligible.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ff , 14.60.Pq , 12.15.Hh .

May 2002

---

[*] Work supported in part by the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research (KBN), grant 5 P03B 119 20 (2001–2002).

1. Introduction. A basic theoretical question, induced by the recent developments in neutrino physics implying massive neutrinos, concerns the fate of neutrino righthanded components $\nu_{\alpha R}$ ($\alpha = e,\, \mu,\, \tau$), while the lefthanded components $\nu_{\alpha L}$ ($\alpha = e,\, \mu,\, \tau$) appear in the Standard Model as active neutrinos. This is equivalent to the question of the role in Nature of (conventional) sterile neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha R}$ and $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c$, where $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c \neq \nu_{\alpha L}$ due to the opposite lepton number L of both sides. The lepton number, in fact, is experimentally well defined, though it is not expected to be strictly conserved. In the present note, the (conventional) sterile neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha R}$ and $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c$ will be introduced through the generic neutrino mass term (11). First, however, we will consider the effective neutrino-mass term (3) of Majorana type, where only the active neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha L}$ and $(\nu_{\alpha L})^c$ appear.

As is well known, the popular nearly bimaximal mixing matrix for three active neutrinos ν_{eL}, $\nu_{\mu L}$, $\nu_{\tau L}$ [1],

$$U^{(3)} = \left(\begin{array}{ccc} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12}c_{23} & c_{12}c_{23} & s_{23} \\ s_{12}s_{23} & -c_{12}s_{23} & c_{23} \end{array} \right) \,, \tag{1}$$

arises from its generic form *à la* Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa [2] by putting

$$s_{13} = 0 \;\;,\;\; c_{12} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \simeq s_{12} \;\;,\;\; c_{23} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \simeq s_{23} \,. \tag{2}$$

Here, $c_{ij} = \cos\theta_{ij}$ and $s_{ij} = \sin\theta_{ij}$. Such a neutrino mixing matrix is globally consistent with oscillation experiments [3] for solar ν_e's and atmospheric ν_μ's as well as with the negative Chooz experiment for reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$'s. It cannot explain, however, the possible LSND effect for accelerator $\bar{\nu}_\mu$'s (and ν_μ's) that, if confirmed, may require the existence of one at least, extra (sterile) light neutrino ν_{sL} (different in general from $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c$).

If the active neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha L}$ are of Majorana type, their effective mass term in the Lagrangian has the form

$$-\mathcal{L}^{(3)}_{\rm mass} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\beta} \overline{(\nu_{\alpha L})^c} M^{(3)}_{\alpha\beta} \nu_{\beta L} + {\rm h.\,c.} \,, \tag{3}$$

where the mass matrix $M^{(3)} = \left(M^{(3)}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$ is symmetric due to the identity $\overline{\nu_{\alpha L}}(\nu_{\beta L})^c = \overline{\nu_{\beta L}}(\nu_{\alpha L})^c$ (here, the normal ordering of bilinear neutrino terms is implicit). In this case,

$(\nu_{\alpha L})^c$ behaves as $\nu_{\alpha R}$, though their lepton number L is opposite. This number is not conserved, of course, in the mass term (3) inducing the changes $\Delta L = \pm 2$.

In the flavor representation, where the charged-lepton 3×3 mass matrix is diagonal, the mixing matrix $U^{(3)}$, when multiplied from the right by the Majorana phase matrix $\mathrm{diag}(1,\, e^{i\rho},\, e^{i\sigma})$ in the case of Majorana-type neutrinos, becomes the diagonalizing matrix that transforms the complex symmetric neutrino 3×3 mass matrix $M^{(3)}$ into the matrix $\mathrm{diag}(m_1\,,\, m_2\,,\, m_3)$. Here $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq m_3$ are nonnegative neutrino masses. This is equivalent to the following complex orthogonal transformation [4]:

$$U^{(3)\,T} M^{(3)} U^{(3)} = \mathrm{diag}(m_1\,,\, m_2\, \mathrm{e}^{-2i\rho}\,,\, m_3\, \mathrm{e}^{-2i\sigma})\ ,\ \ U^{(3)\,T} U^{(3)*} = 1 = U^{(3)*} U^{(3)\,T}\ . \tag{4}$$

The reverse transformation reads

$$M^{(3)} = U^{(3)*} \mathrm{diag}(m_1\,,\, m_2 \mathrm{e}^{-2i\rho}\,,\, m_3 \mathrm{e}^{-2i\sigma}) U^{(3)\dagger}\ . \tag{5}$$

However, even in the Majorana case, the flavor and mass active neutrinos, $\nu_{\alpha L}$ $(\alpha = e, \mu, \tau)$ and ν_{iL} $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, are related through the unitary transformation

$$\nu_{\alpha L} = \sum_i U^{(3)}_{\alpha i} \nu_{iL}\ \ ,\ \ U^{(3)\,\dagger} U^{(3)} = 1 = U^{(3)} U^{(3)\,\dagger}\ , \tag{6}$$

where $U^{(3)} = \left(U^{(3)}_{\alpha i}\right)$. The unknown Majorana phases ρ and σ as well as the Dirac phase δ, the latter appearing in the generic form of $U^{(3)}$ if $s_{13} \neq 0$ (*e.g.* through $U_{e3} = s_{13} e^{-i\delta}$), may lead to CP violation. Note, however, that CP violation in the neutrino oscillations may be caused only by δ.

The rate of the neutrinoless double β decay (allowed only in the case of Majorana-type ν_{eL}) is proportional to m^2_{ee}, where $m_{ee} \equiv |M^{(3)}_{ee}|$ with $M^{(3)}_{ee}$ as given in Eq. (5) for $\alpha = e$ and $\beta = e$. The suggested experimental upper limit of m_{ee} is $m_{ee} \lesssim (0.35 - 1)$ eV [4]. If $\rho = 0$ and $\sigma = 0$, then $|M^{(3)}_{ee}| = |\sum_i U^{(3)\,2}_{ei} m_i| = c^2_{12} m_1 + s^2_{12} m_2$, where the form (1) for $U^{(3)}$ is used.

The familiar neutrino-oscillation formulae, valid in the case of $U^{(3)*}_{\alpha i} = U^{(3)}_{\alpha i}$ (where the possible CP violation is ignored), are

$$P(\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta) = |\langle \nu_{\beta L}| e^{iPL} |\nu_{\alpha L}\rangle|^2 = \delta_{\beta\alpha} - 4 \sum_{j>i} U^{(3)}_{\beta j} U^{(3)}_{\beta i} U^{(3)}_{\alpha j} U^{(3)}_{\alpha i} \sin^2 x_{ji} \tag{7}$$

with

$$x_{ji} = 1.27\frac{\Delta m^2_{ji} L}{E}\ ,\ \Delta m^2_{ji} = m^2_j - m^2_i\ ,\ p_i \simeq E - \frac{m^2_i}{2E} \tag{8}$$

(Δm^2, L and E are measured in eV^2, km and GeV, respectively). Here, $P(\nu_\alpha \to \nu_\beta) = P(\bar{\nu}_\alpha \to \bar{\nu}_\beta) = P(\nu_\beta \to \nu_\alpha)$, when CP violation in neutrino oscillation is ignored (and CPT theorem used). For the mixing matrix $U^{(3)}$ as given in Eq. (1), the formulae (7) lead, in particular, to the following oscillation probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_e \to \nu_e) &= 1 - (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 \sin^2 x_{21}\ , \\ P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu) &= 1 - (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 c^4_{23} \sin^2 x_{21} - (2c_{23}s_{23})^2 (s^2_{12} \sin^2 x_{31} + c^2_{12} \sin^2 x_{32}) \\ &\simeq 1 - (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 c^4_{23} \sin^2 x_{21} - (2c_{23}s_{23})^2 \sin^2 x_{32}\ , \\ P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e) &= (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 c^2_{23} \sin^2 x_{21}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the second step for $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu)$ works in the case of $\Delta m^2_{31} \simeq \Delta m^2_{32}$. The remaining oscillation probabilities, $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_e)$, $P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\tau)$ and $P(\nu_\tau \to \nu_\tau)$, follow already from Eqs. (9) through the probability sum rules $\sum_\beta P(\nu_\alpha \to \nu_\beta) = 1$. The relations (9) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} P(\nu_e \to \nu_e)_{\rm sol} &= 1 - (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 \sin^2 (x_{21})_{\rm sol}\ , \\ P(\nu_\mu \to \nu_\mu)_{\rm atm} &\simeq 1 - (2c_{23}s_{23})^2 \sin^2 (x_{32})_{\rm atm}\ , \\ P(\bar{\nu}_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm LSND} &= (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 c^2_{23} \sin^2 (x_{21})_{\rm LSND} \simeq 0\ , \\ P(\bar{\nu}_e \to \bar{\nu}_e)_{\rm Chooz} &= 1 - (2c_{12}s_{12})^2 \sin^2 (x_{21})_{\rm Chooz} \simeq 1\ , \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

since $(x_{21})_{\rm atm} \ll (x_{32})_{\rm atm} = O(1)$, $(x_{21})_{\rm LSND} \ll (x_{21})_{\rm sol} = O(1)$ and $(x_{21})_{\rm Chooz} \simeq (x_{21})_{\rm atm} \ll O(1)$, the first inequality being valid in the case of $\Delta m^2_{21} \ll \Delta m^2_{32} \simeq \Delta m^2_{31}$. The labels sol, atm, LSND and Chooz refer to the conditions of solar, atmospheric, LSND and Chooz neutrino experiments.

Experimental estimations for solar ν_e's and atmospheric ν_μ's are $\theta_{12} \sim 32^\circ$, $\Delta m^2_{21} \sim 5 \times 10^{-5}$ eV^2 [5] and $\theta_{32} \sim 45^\circ$, $\Delta m^2_{32} \sim 2.5 \times 10^{-3}$ eV^2 [6], respectively (they are best-fit values; for solar ν_e's they correspond to the MSW Large Mixing Angle solution that seems to be optimal). The above angles imply $c_{12} \sim 1.2/\sqrt{2}$, $s_{12} \sim 0.75/\sqrt{2}$ and $c_{23} \sim 1/\sqrt{2} \sim s_{23}$, thus deviations from maximal mixing for solar ν_e's are considerable.

According to the popular viewpoint, the active-neutrino effective mass term (3) arises through the familiar see-saw mechanism from the generic neutrino mass term

$$- \mathcal{L}_{\rm mass} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \left(\overline{(\nu_{\alpha L})^c} \,,\, \overline{\nu_{\alpha R}} \right) \left(\begin{array}{cc} M^{(L)}_{\alpha\beta} & M^{(D)}_{\alpha\beta} \\ M^{(D)}_{\beta\alpha} & M^{(R)}_{\alpha\beta} \end{array} \right) \left(\begin{array}{c} \nu_{\beta L} \\ (\nu_{\beta R})^c \end{array} \right) + {\rm h.\,c.} \tag{11}$$

including both the active neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha L}$ and $(\nu_{\alpha L})^c$ as well as the (conventional) sterile neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha R} \neq (\nu_{\alpha L})^c$ and $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c \neq \nu_{\alpha L}$ $(\alpha = e\,,\,\mu\,,\,\tau)$. In the see-saw case, the Majorana righthanded mass matrix $M^{(R)} = \left(M^{(R)}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$ is presumed to dominate over the Dirac mass matrix $M^{(D)} = \left(M^{(D)}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$ that in turn is expected to dominate over the Majorana lefthanded mass matrix $M^{(L)} = \left(M^{(L)}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$ (the latter may be even zero). Such a mechanism leads effectively to the active-neutrino mass matrix $M^{(3)} = \left(M^{(3)}_{\alpha\beta}\right)$ appearing in the mass term (3). Then, $M^{(3)} \simeq -M^{(D)} M^{(R)\,-1} M^{(D)\,T}$, while the (conventional) sterile neutrinos get approximately $M^{(R)}$ as their effective mass matrix and so, are practically *decoupled* from the active neutrinos. Thus, the assumption of dominance of $M^{(R)}$ over $M^{(D)}$ (and $M^{(D)}$ over $M^{(L)}$) guarantees here the desired smallness of $m_1\,,\, m_2\,,\, m_3$. This approach is consistent with the GUT viewpoint on the massive-neutrino unification.

In the present note, we study a new explicit model for the overall 6×6 mass matrix

$$M = \left(\begin{array}{cc} M^{(L)} & M^{(D)} \\ M^{(D)\,T} & M^{(R)} \end{array} \right) \tag{12}$$

appearing in the generic neutrino mass term (11). Now, $M^{(L)}$ and $M^{(R)}$ get the same magnitude (but opposite sign). The detailed model gives *exactly the same* neutrino oscillation formulae (9) and (10) as the previous effective model based on the nearly bimaximal 3×3 mixing matrix (1). The (conventional) sterile neutrinos $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c$ *do not oscillate* with the active neutrinos $\nu_{\alpha L}$ (and with themselves) and so, are strictly *decoupled* from the active neutrinos (because of different reasons, than those causing practical decoupling of $(\nu_{\alpha R})^c$ from $\nu_{\alpha L}$ in the see-saw mechanism). The suggested LSND effect *vanishes.* The neutrino mass spectrum is parametrized. In extreme cases, the spectrum may be either nearly degenerate or hierarchical (with hierarchical mass-squared differences in both cases). Always $m_1 = -m_4$, $m_2 = -m_5$, $m_3 = -m_6$ and, as can be deduced in our model from neutrino data, they are light.

2. The model. Let us assume in Eq. (12) that [8]

$$M^{(L)} = \overset{0}{m} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = -M^{(R)} \tag{13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M^{(D)} &= \overset{0}{m}\, U^{(3)} \begin{pmatrix} \tan 2\theta_{14} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tan 2\theta_{25} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \tan 2\theta_{36} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \overset{0}{m} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} \tan 2\theta_{14} & s_{12} \tan 2\theta_{25} & 0 \\ -s_{12} c_{23} \tan 2\theta_{14} & c_{12} c_{23} \tan 2\theta_{25} & s_{23} \tan 2\theta_{36} \\ s_{12} s_{23} \tan 2\theta_{14} & -c_{12} s_{23} \tan 2\theta_{25} & c_{23} \tan 2\theta_{36} \end{pmatrix} , \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $\overset{0}{m} > 0$ is a mass scale and $\tan 2\theta_{ij}$ $(ij = 14, 25, 36)$ denote three dimensionless parameters, while $U^{(3)}$ stands for the previous 3×3 mixing matrix given in Eq. (1). Thus, the Dirac component $M^{(D)}$ of the overall neutrino mass matrix M is here equal to a diagonal, potentially hierarchical structure, deformed by the popular, nearly bimaximal mixing matrix $U^{(3)}$. Evidently, in this 6×6 model, $M^* = M$ and $M^T = M$. Hence, the possible CP violation is ignored.

As can be shown, the 6×6 diagonalizing matrix U for the overall 6×6 mass matrix M defined in Eqs. (12), (13) and (14),

$$U^\dagger M U = \mathrm{diag}(m_1\,, m_2\,, m_3\,, m_4\,, m_5\,, m_6)\;, \tag{15}$$

gets the form

$$U = \overset{1}{U}\overset{0}{U}\;,\; \overset{1}{U} = \begin{pmatrix} U^{(3)} & 0^{(3)} \\ 0^{(3)} & 1^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} \;,\; \overset{0}{U} = \begin{pmatrix} C^{(3)} & -S^{(3)} \\ S^{(3)} & C^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} \tag{16}$$

with $U^{(3)}$ as given in Eq. (1) and

$$1^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \;,\; C^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{14} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{25} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & c_{36} \end{pmatrix} \;,\; S^{(3)} = \begin{pmatrix} s_{14} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s_{25} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s_{36} \end{pmatrix} \;, \tag{17}$$

while the neutrino mass spectrum is

$$m_{i,j} = \pm \overset{0}{m} \sqrt{1 + \tan^2 2\theta_{ij}} \tag{18}$$

$(ij = 14\,,\ 25\,,\ 36)$, implying the equalities

$$\left(c^2_{ij} - s^2_{ij}\right) m_{i,j} = \pm \overset{0}{m}\ . \tag{19}$$

Evidently, $U^* = U$ and $U^\dagger = U^T$.

The easiest way to prove the statement expressed in Eqs. (16), (1) and (17) is to start with the diagonalizing matrix $U = (U_{\alpha i})$ defined in these equations, and then to show by applying the formula $M_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i U_{\alpha i} m_i U^*_{\beta i}$ that the mass matrix $M = (M_{\alpha\beta})$ is given in Eqs. (12), (13) and (14), if the mass spectrum $m_1\,,\ m_2\,,\ m_3\,,\ m_4\,,\ m_5\,,\ m_6$ is taken in the form (18) or (19). Now, $\alpha = e\,,\ \mu\,,\ \tau\,,\ e_s\,,\ \mu_s\,,\ \tau_s$ and $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$, where $\nu_{e_s L} \equiv (\nu_{eR})^c$, $\nu_{\mu_s L} \equiv (\nu_{\mu R})^c$, $\nu_{\tau_s L} \equiv (\nu_{\tau R})^c$ (see Eq. (11) which can be rewritten as $-\mathcal{L}_{\rm mass} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\beta} \overline{(\nu_{\alpha L})^c} M_{\alpha\beta} \nu_{\beta L} + {\rm h.\,c.}$).

It may be interesting to note that the 6×6 mass matrix M defined in Eqs. (12), (13) and (14) can be presented as the unitary transform $M = \overset{1}{U}\overset{0}{M}\,\overset{1}{U}{}^\dagger$ of the new simpler 6×6 mass matrix

$$\overset{0}{M} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \overset{0}{m}\, 1^{(3)} & \overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)} \\ \overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)\,T} & -\,\overset{0}{m}\, 1^{(3)} \end{array} \right) \ \text{with}\ \ \overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)} = \overset{0}{m}\ {\rm diag}(\tan 2\theta_{14}, \tan 2\theta_{25}, \tan 2\theta_{36})\ , \tag{20}$$

where $\overset{1}{U} = {\rm diag}\big(U^{(3)}, 1^{(3)}\big)$ [see Eqs. (16) and (17)]. Then, writing $\nu_{\alpha L} = \sum_\beta \overset{1}{U}_{\alpha\beta}\, \overset{0}{\nu}_{\beta L}$ with $\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L} = \sum_i \overset{0}{U}_{\alpha i} \nu_{iL}$, the mass term (11) and charged-current term in the Lagrangian can be presented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} -\,\mathcal{L}_{\rm mass} &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\beta} \overline{(\nu_{\alpha L})^c} M_{\alpha\beta} \nu_{\beta L} + {\rm h.\,c.} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\alpha\beta} \overline{(\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L})^c}\, \overset{0}{M}_{\alpha\beta}\, \overset{0}{\nu}_{\beta L} + {\rm h.\,c.} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_i \overline{(\nu_{iL})^c} m_i \nu_{iL} + {\rm h.\,c.} \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

$(\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau, e_s, \mu_s, \tau_s\ ,\ i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} -\,\mathcal{L}_{\rm CC} &= \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha = e,\mu,\tau} \overline{\nu_{\alpha L}}\, \gamma^\mu e^-_\alpha\, W^+_\mu + {\rm h.\,c.} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha = e,\mu,\tau}\ \sum_{\beta = e,\mu,\tau} \overline{\overset{0}{\nu}_{\beta L}}\ \overset{1}{U}{}^*_{\alpha\beta}\, \gamma^\mu e^-_\alpha\, W^+_\mu + {\rm h.\,c.} \\ &= \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{\alpha = e,\mu,\tau}\ \sum_i \overline{\nu_{iL}}\, U^*_{\alpha i} \gamma^\mu e^-_\alpha\, W^+_\mu + {\rm h.\,c.} \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

$(i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)$, where $e^-_\alpha = e^-\,,\, \mu^-\,,\, \tau^-$ $(\alpha = e, \mu, \tau)$ and $g = e/\sin\theta_W$. Thus, there are two different forms of CC coupling, involving $\nu_{\alpha L}$ neutrinos with nearly bimaximally mixed Dirac mass matrix $M^{(D)} = U^{(3)}\overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)}$ or $\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L}$ neutrinos with hierarchical Dirac mass matrix $\overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)}$. Similarly, there are two different forms of neutral-current term $\mathcal{L}_{\rm NC}$ involving $\nu_{\alpha L}$ or $\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L}$:

$$\begin{aligned} -\,\mathcal{L}_{\rm NC} &= \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \sum_{\alpha=e,\mu,\tau} \overline{\nu_{\alpha L}}\, \gamma^\mu \nu_{\alpha L}\, Z_\mu \\ &= \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \sum_{\alpha=e,\mu,\tau} \overline{\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L}}\, \gamma^\mu \overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L} Z_\mu \;. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In Eqs. (22) and (23) the block-diagonal form $\overset{1}{U} = {\rm diag}\Big(U^{(3)}, 1^{(3)}\Big)$ was applied. Note that both mass matrices M and $\overset{0}{M}$ develop the same eigenvalues $m_1 = -m_4\,,\, m_2 = -m_5\,,\, m_3 = -m_6$ given in Eq. (18). In fact, Eq. (15) implies that

$$\overset{0}{U}{}^\dagger \overset{0}{M} \overset{0}{U} = {\rm diag}(m_1\,,\, m_2\,,\, m_3\,,\, m_4\,,\, m_5\,,\, m_6)\;. \tag{24}$$

We can see that, in principle, one can operate with fields $\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L}$ to describe by them the experimental flavor neutrinos, $\nu_{\alpha L} = \sum_\beta \overset{1}{U}_{\alpha\beta} \overset{0}{\nu}_{\beta L}$, using then the second forms (22) and (23) of $\mathcal{L}_{\rm CC}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\rm NC}$. However, their transformation by means of $\overset{1}{U}$ is necessary.

In the flavor representation, where the charged-lepton 3×3 mass matrix is diagonal, the 6×6 diagonalizing matrix U is at the same time the neutrino 6×6 mixing matrix. Then, the unitary transformation

$$\nu_{\alpha L} = \sum_i U_{\alpha i} \nu_{iL}\;,\; U^\dagger U = 1 = U U^\dagger \tag{25}$$

holds with the α and i indices running over their six values.

The rate for the neutrinoless double β decay is proportional to m^2_{ee}, where now

$$\begin{aligned} m_{ee} \equiv |\sum_i U^2_{ei} m_i| &= |\left(U^2_{e1} - U^2_{e4}\right) m_1 + \left(U^2_{e2} - U^2_{e5}\right) m_2 + \left(U^2_{e3} - U^2_{e6}\right) m_3| \\ &= |c^2_{12}\left(c^2_{14} - s^2_{14}\right) m_1 + s^2_{12}\left(c^2_{25} - s^2_{25}\right) m_2| = \overset{0}{m} \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

due to Eqs. (16), (1), (17) and (19). Hence, $\overset{0}{m} \lesssim (0.35 - 1)$ eV is light if the suggested experimentally upper limit of m_{ee} is used.

Making use of the neutrino oscillation formulae as given in Eq. (7) but now with $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau, e_s, \mu_s, \tau_s$ and $i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$, we obtain the oscillation probabilities $P(\nu_\alpha \to \nu_\beta)$ for $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ *identical* with those in Eq. (9) and (10). In addition, we get $P(\nu_\alpha \to \nu_{\beta_s}) = 0$ and $P(\nu_{\alpha_s} \to \nu_{\beta_s}) = \delta_{\beta_s \alpha_s}$ for $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ and $\alpha_s, \beta_s = e_s, \mu_s, \tau_s$, showing that in our 6×6 model of neutrino texture there are *no oscillations* of (conventional) sterile neutrinos which, therefore, are strictly *decoupled.* In this argument, we make use of the mass-squared degeneracy relations $m_1^2 = m_4^2\,,\, m_2^2 = m_5^2\,,\, m_3^2 = m_6^2$ following from the mass spectrum (18).

From the neutrino mass spectrum (18) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta m_{21}^2 &= \overset{0}{m}{}^2 \left(\tan^2 2\theta_{25} - \tan^2 2\theta_{14}\right) \;, \\
\Delta m_{32}^2 &= \overset{0}{m}{}^2 \left(\tan^2 2\theta_{36} - \tan^2 2\theta_{25}\right) \;, \\
\Delta m_{31}^2 &= \overset{0}{m}{}^2 \left(\tan^2 2\theta_{36} - \tan^2 2\theta_{14}\right) \;, \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

where experimental estimations for solar ν_e's and atmospheric ν_μ's are

$$\Delta m_{21}^2 = 5 \times 10^{-5}\ \mathrm{eV}^2 \ll \Delta m_{32}^2 = 2.5 \times 10^{-3}\ \mathrm{eV}^2 \qquad (28)$$

if $\Delta m_{31}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{32}^2$. This implies that $\tan^2 2\theta_{14} < \tan^2 2\theta_{25} \ll \tan^2 2\theta_{36}$, where $(\tan^2 2\theta_{25} - \tan^2 2\theta_{14})/\tan^2 2\theta_{36} \simeq \Delta m_{21}^2/\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 0.02$. Thus, for the neutrino mass spectrum there are, in particular, two opposite extreme options: the *nearly degenerate* spectrum $m_1 \simeq m_2 \simeq m_3$, where $\tan^2 2\theta_{ij} \ll 1$ implying light $m_i \simeq \overset{0}{m} \lesssim (0.35-1)$ eV, and the *hierarchical* spectrum $m_1 < m_2 \ll m_3$, where $\tan^2 2\theta_{ij} \gg 1$ implying $m_i \simeq \overset{0}{m}|\tan 2\theta_{ij}|$, also light since $m_3^2 \simeq \Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 2.5 \times 10^{-3}\,\mathrm{eV}^2$ $(ij = 14, 25, 36)$. In both options, the mass-squared differences are hierarchical: $\Delta m_{21}^2 \ll \Delta m_{32}^2 \simeq \Delta m_{31}^2$. In the first option, $M^{(L)}$ and $M^{(R)}$ dominate over $M^{(D)}$, as can be seen from Eqs. (13) and (14). Inversely, in the second option, $M^{(L)}$ and $M^{(R)}$ are dominated by $M^{(D)}$, thus we have to do in this option with the pseudo-Dirac neutrinos [9] (of a specific sort). The first option is favored, if the actual $\overset{0}{m} = m_{ee}$ lies near its present upper limit.

3. Conclusions. In this note, a new explicit model of neutrino texture was presented, where in the overall 6×6 mass matrix M the lefthanded and righthanded Majorana 3×3 mass matrices, $M^{(L)}$ and $M^{(R)}$, are diagonal with equal entries of opposite sign, while the

Dirac 3×3 mass matrix $M^{(D)}$ is given as a diagonal hierarchical structure deformed by the popular nearly bimaximal 3×3 mixing matrix. The neutrino 6×6 mixing matrix U and neutrino mass spectrum are found explicitly. Then, all neutrino masses are light and $m_1 = -m_4\,,\, m_2 = -m_5\,,\, m_3 = -m_6$, where $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq m_3$. If, in particular, $M^{(L)}$ and $M^{(R)}$ dominate over $M^{(D)}$, then $m_1 \simeq m_2 \simeq m_3$. Inversely, if $M^{(L)}$ and $M^{(R)}$ are dominated by $M^{(D)}$, then $m_1 < m_2 \ll m_3$. But, always $\Delta m^2_{21} \ll \Delta m^2_{32} \simeq \Delta m^2_{31}$ (due to experimental estimations for solar ν_e's and atmospheric ν_μ's). In the second option, neutrinos are pseudo-Dirac particles (of a specific sort).

The resulting neutrino oscillation formulae are *identical* with those working in the effective texture of three active neutrinos, based on the popular nearly bimaximal mixing matrix. Three (conventional) sterile neutrinos *do not oscillate* and so, are strictly *decoupled*. The suggested LSND effect for accelerator $\bar{\nu}_\mu$'s (and ν_μ's) *vanishes*. The not observed Chooz oscillation effect for reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$'s is consistently negligible.

One may try to speculate that the Dirac component $\overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)}$ of $\overset{0}{M}$ as defined in Eq. (20) (before the conjectured deformation $M^{(D)} = U^{(3)}\, \overset{0}{M}{}^{(D)}$ by the nearly bimaximal mixing matrix $U^{(3)}$ is performed) ought to display a hierarchical structure *similar* to that of 3×3 mass matrices for charged leptons and quarks [10] which, of course, are of Dirac type. In this sense, $\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L} = \sum_i \overset{0}{U}_{\alpha i} \nu_{iL}$ rather than $\nu_{\alpha L} = \sum_i U_{\alpha i} \nu_{iL}$ are neutrino analogues of the familiar CKM transforms of down-quark mass fields. Thus, $\overset{0}{U}$ rather than U is a lepton analogue of the CKM mixing matrix for quarks [see the first and second form of Eq. (22)]. Of course, the experimental flavor neutrino fields are $\nu_{\alpha L} = \sum_\beta \overset{1}{U}_{\alpha\beta}\, \overset{0}{\nu}_{\beta L}$, and only by means of this unitary transformation the nearly bimaximal mixing (absent for $\overset{0}{\nu}_{\alpha L}$ as well as for charged leptons and quarks) works.

References

[1] *Cf. e.g.* Z. Xing, *Phys. Rev.* **D 61**, 057301 (2000); and references therein.

[2] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **28**, 870 (1962).

[3] For a recent review *cf.* M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia and Y. Nir, `hep-ph/0202056`; and references therein.

[4] *Cf. e.g.* M. Frigerio and A.Yu. Smirnov, `hep-ph/0202247`.

[5] V. Barger, D. Marfatia, K. Whisnant and B.P. Wood, `hep-ph/0204253`; J.N. Bahcall, M.C. Gonzalez–Garcia and C. Peña–Garay, `hep-ph/0204314v2`; and references therein.

[6] S. Fukuda *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3999 (2000); and references therein.

[7] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, edited by F. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman, North Holland, 1979; T. Yanagida, Proc. of the *Workshop on Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe*, KEK, Japan, 1979; R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 912 (1980).

[8] *Cf.* W. Królikowski, `hep-ph/0201186`.

[9] *Cf. e.g.* W. Królikowski, *Acta Phys. Pol.* **B 30**, 663 (2000); and references therein.

[10] W. Królikowski, `hep-ph/0201004v2`.